

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127749
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of submergence tolerant improved restorer lines for fertility restoration and phosphorus use efficiency using gene-specific markers in rice ( <i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript contributes significantly to the scientific community by addressing critical challenges in rice production, particularly the development of submergence-tolerant restorer lines with improved fertility restoration and phosphorus use efficiency. By utilizing gene-specific markers, it highlights the potential for precise breeding strategies to enhance resilience and yield in rice, a staple crop feeding billions worldwide. The study also supports sustainable agriculture by promoting low-input and climate-resilient rice varieties, aligning with global efforts to mitigate the impacts of climate change. Furthermore, the findings provide valuable genetic resources and methodologies for researchers and breeders working to improve food security and crop adaptability under environmental stress conditions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable as it effectively captures the key focus areas of the study and highlights its relevance to the scientific community.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive, as it effectively summarizes the key objectives, methodology, and findings of the study. It highlights the evaluation of submergence tolerance, fertility restoration, and phosphorus use efficiency in improved restorer lines using gene-specific markers.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it is grounded in established methodologies and references relevant studies in the field. It employs gene-specific markers for evaluating key traits, which is a recognized approach in molecular breeding and plant genetics.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references in the manuscript are largely sufficient and include a mix of foundational studies and recent research, with many from 2021 to 2024. This demonstrates the manuscript's reliance on up-to-date findings and current advancements in the field.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the article is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could benefit from improved grammar, syntax, and clarity to enhance readability and precision. Minor revisions in phrasing and word choice may help ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards of academic writing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Thi Lang Nguyen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Genomic Research Institute and Seed, Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam</b>